Remarks

Upon filing of the RCE, it is understood that all aspects of the amendment mailed to the U.S.P.T.O. on September 1, 2004, will be entered.

The above new amendments add no new matter. It has always been clear from the original claims that the method is for extruding "blow molding" film. It has thus always also been clear to a person of even minimal skill in the art that the extruded film is in the form of a tube since blow molding of a flat film is not possible, i.e. there is no film enclosed area in a flat film to hold air to permit "blowing".

A new apparatus claim 10 has been added having slightly different limitations than claim 2. All limitations in claim 10 find support in the specification.

The Examiner maintains that Claim 8 fails to further restrict Claim 2 as required by 35 U.S.C. 112. The applicants respectfully disagree. Once it is stated that the tube acts as a guide it is clear to one skilled in the art that additional limitations are inherent, e.g. that the tube must be of a diameter close to the diameter of the extruded film. A tube having a large diameter relative to the extruded film clearly cannot act as a guide, e.g. a tubular tank or a large spin tube 10 relative to the diameter of the extrusion as disclosed by Blades et al.. The rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 3,767,756 to Blades.

This 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 of the current patent application requires that the apparatus include

- extrusion means for continuously extruding a cellulose solution to produce a **blown tubular** cellulose **film**;

- precipitation means for solidifying the extruded cellulose **film**;

- draw means positioned downstream of the extrusion means for continuously drawing the extruded cellulose film from the extrusion means; and

- a tubular member **for containing precipitation means** and **for receiving the extruded blown film** wherein the **tubular member is situated within a precipitation bath**.

Blades does not disclose or suggest any of the above claim limitations set out in bold and underlined.

Blades teaching with respect to extrusion is entirely limited to fibers. As an aside, Blades mentions film in column 2, line 6 but says nothing at all about how such a film might be made and gives no suggestion as to any characteristics such a film might have.

The present claims require an extrusion means for continuously extruding a cellulose solution to produce a **blown tubular** cellulose **film.** The only extrusion apparatus discussed by Blades is a spinning block 2 and a spinneret 3 suitable only for fibers. There is no disclosure or suggestion anywhere in Blades about an extrusion die suitable for extruding film and certainly not for extruding tubular film and even more certainly not for extruding blown tubular film. The differences are in fact so great that Blades is non-analogous art.

Blades further does not disclose or suggest any precipitation means for solidifying an extruded cellulose film. Precipitation means for solidifying polyamide fibers are entirely different and do not suggest precipitation means for cellulose films.

The Blades further does not suggest a tubular member for containing precipitation means. Item 10 in Blades contains nothing as it is completely open at its lower end causing flow disturbances. Blades does not disclose or suggest anything for receiving blown film since Blades suggests nothing at all concerning blown film. In fact the tube 10 of Blades for receiving fibers is not suitable for receiving blown tubular film since a co-current precipitant flow, as taught by Blades for fibers, cannot work for tubular film. Fibers are small in diameter and precipitant can reach the material of the fiber from four directions. This is simply not true of tubular films that are hollow inside thus eliminating one direction for penetration of precipitant and comprise a circular cross section effectively eliminating two more directions for penetration of precipitant. Tubular films utilized in the Blades apparatus (even if suggested by Blades, which is not the case) would thus be penetrated only one direction. Further turbulent flow through the relatively large tube 10 of Blades cannot be tolerated in the manufacture of film. Blades co-current (non-immersion)flow of precipitant would precipitate the film in an unacceptable spotty arrangement at best.

The present claims require **a tubular member that is situated within a precipitation bath.** Blades does not suggest such an apparatus. **Blades tube 10 is not situated within a precipitation bath** but extends from the bath at its lower end thus keeping the tube from being consistently filled with precipitation means. **This is the antithesis of and precisely contrary to the requirements of the presently claimed invention.**

As clearly pointed out beginning at line 16 of original page 7 of the specification, the tubular member of the present invention may be used as a guide for the extruded tubular

film and may be used to protect the extruded tube from disturbances in the precipitation medium thus resulting in improved uniformity of the tube wall thickness. The tubular member also acts to control flow of precipitation medium around the tube and may be transparent to permit observation of the tube as it is formed thus providing quality control (page 8 of the original specification). Blades flow through open tube 10 is of necessity turbulent and is clearly contrary to the requirements of the present invention. Further, it is clear that the open tube 10 of Blades et al. does not "act as a guide" for anything and certainly not for a blown film as required by the present claims.

It is thus clear that Blades does not disclose or suggest the present invention and that the rejection based upon Blades should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael L. Dunn
Registration No.25,330
CUSTOMER NO. 24041
Simpson & Simpson, PLLC
5555 Main Street
Williamsville, NY 14221-5406
Telephone No. 716-626-1564

MLD/mjk
Dated: November 1, 2004